

REMARKS

In the Office Action of March 18, 2004, claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11, 13-17, 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Butterworth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,226,611).

Claims 2, 3, 6, 12, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Butterworth.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Butterworth in view of Perini (U. S. Patent No. 4,487,377).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over Butterworth. Respectfully, Butterworth does not disclose an apparatus for severing a web that includes a rotating transfer roll that is configured for supplying a single winding roll during rotation of the rotating transfer roll. Support for this claim amendment may be found in at least figure 3 of the drawing that shows the transfer roll 21 supplying a single winding roll 32 during rotation of the transfer roll 21.

Butterworth is directed towards a rewinder for rewinding a web of paper. The entire point of Butterworth is stated as overcoming shortcomings of prior rewinders by providing a rewinder that has uninterrupted three roll contact throughout the winding cycle to substantially improve product quality as the paper web is wound (see Butterworth at column 1, lines 25-29). As shown in figure 3 of Butterworth, a transfer station 38 is provided that receives paper web from the transfer roll 28. The transfer station 38 includes the transfer roll 28, chop roll 34, and winding rolls 40, 42 (see Butterworth at column 2, line 68 to column 3, line 2). The paper web is transported from the transfer station 38 and wound at two separate rewinder stations 46, 47 (see

Butterworth at column 2, lines 31-35). While one rewinder station 47 builds a log of paper web, the other rewinder station 46 is supplied with a new core (see Butterworth at column 2, lines 35-38). When the log is completed at rewinder station 47, a new log is built at rewinder station 46 and rewinder station 47 is provided with a new core (see Butterworth at column 2, lines 38-41).

By using a pair of winding rolls 40, 42 to feed a pair of rewinding stations 46, 47, Butterworth allows for a log to be wound at one station while the other station discharges a completed log and receives a new core for winding a subsequent log (see Butterworth at column 3, lines 52-55). Alternating winding between the pair of winding stations 46, 47 provides a smooth, controlled, adjustable transition from one log to the next with consistent web tension throughout the winding cycle and without stopping the web (see Butterworth at column 3, lines 55-60).

Butterworth therefore explicitly discloses a transfer roll 28 that supplies two winding rolls 40, 42. Further, Butterworth explicitly teaches that the use of two winding rolls 40, 42 provides a smooth, controlled, adjustable transition along with uninterrupted winding and improved product quality. The entire disclosure of Butterworth is directed towards a pair of winding rolls 40, 42 supplied by the rotating transfer roll 28 in order to provide for an improved rewinder. In fact, Butterworth is entitled "Twin Station Rewinder."

Claim 1 of Applicants' application calls for an essentially opposite structure in that the rotating transfer roll in claim 1 is configured for supplying a single winding roll during rotation of the rotating transfer roll. The structure set forth in claim 1 of Applicants' application is not disclosed or rendered obvious by the rewinder in Butterworth. As

such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over Butterworth and is in condition for allowance. Further, all claims that depend from claim 1 (claims 2-6 and 8) are also in condition for allowance. Their rejections being made moot due to the allowance of claim 1.

Also in the present Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 9, 14, and 15 in a manner similar to, although not exact to, the amendment made to claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 14 and 15 define over Butterworth for essentially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, all claims that depend from claims 9 and 15 (claims 10-13 and 16-22) are also allowable. Their rejections being made moot due to the allowance of claims 9 and 15.

With the present Amendment, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at his convenience to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

Date

June 18, 2004


Neal P. Pierotti
Reg. No. 45,716
P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
(864) 271-1592
FAX (864) 233-7342